DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 457 CS 213 363

AUTHOR Allen, Michael S.
TITLE Assessment and Invention: Roundtable Report.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English Departments; Essays; *Freshman Composition; Higher Education; *Portfolios (Background Materials); Teacher Attitudes; *Writing Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Alternative Assessment; Direct Assessment; Northwest Missouri State University; Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

A pilot project in portfolio assessment was carried out at Northwest Missouri State University by the English department for the general proficiency assessment which the administration had requested. The portfolio was designed around the central feature of the second semester composition course: the research essay. Besides the research essay, the portfolio would contain (1) a direct assessment; (2) an essay of the student's choice; (3) an essay from a course not in the English department; and (4) a reflective letter. A great virtue of portfolio assessment is that it enables teachers of writing to gain other perspectives on making evaluations. It allows teachers to place their evaluations in a bigger context, and by so doing to gain in assessment skills. The biggest gains came from the experience with the direct assessment, resulting in a change of views toward direct assessment as a separate genre of writing. By the end of the portfolio project, the department members who had enthusiastically backed it and carried it out experienced a sense of shared benefits and gains in teaching and evaluation. However, some of their departmental colleagues were not willing to follow their lead into the experience of portfolio evaluation. Arguments against portfolio assessment stressed that it takes too much time, is too much work, and is "unobjective and uncontrolled." However, the idea of portfolio assessment does seem to be making some headway in the university and remains a valuable option for institutions considering various programs of writing assessment. (A detailed "Northwest Missouri State University: Writing Portfolio Report Summary" is attached.) (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346457

Assessment and Invention: Roundtable Report

Michael S. Allen

When my colleagues and I proposed this roundtable last June, we had just completed a pilot project in portfolio assessment, were excited by the results, and were encouraged by the amount of interest and support the project had generated in our department. We knew that some of our colleagues in the department did not share our enthusiasm but we felt that, over time, they would come around. We had done a lot of work, including a comparison of direct assessment and portfolio assessment scores, and we had all learn a great deal about portfolios, about working together and about our teaching. We expected that by the end of the Fall 1991 semester, our department would have approved the portfolio for the proficiency assessment which our administration had asked us to implement. However, by the end of the Fall, 1991 semester, the portfolio had been defeated in a close departmental vote, and in its place the department chose a direct assessment that can be characterized as suspicious of both instructors and students. This report will outline our pilot portfolio project and include some speculation about why the department rejected the portfolio proposal and chose the assessment instrument it chose.

First, some background context is important. As a public university in Missouri, Northwest has been subject to the same pressures for assessment and accountability from our Governor Ashcroft that all Missouri public universities have felt. However, Northwest has resisted these pressures a bit more than our sister institutions. Unlike our sister English departments across the state, our English department has not had a writing assessment program for over ten years; the previous program was what can charitably called a "bad experience," where the writing assessment program had been designed and administered by professors outside the English department. The lore from this previous assessment program still lives in the department, evinced by several departmental colleagues who felt that an assessment program would lead to unnecessary and punitive oversight on the part of the administration. These colleagues were suspicious of any assessment program; it may be that some of this suspicion eventually led to the departmental vote.

Since some in the department were suspicious of writing assessment, we on the Freshman Writing Committee decided to design a portfolio which could answer some, if not all,

CS213363

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael S. Allen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

of their questions. I myself wondered aloud to my committee colleagues if the department was ready for portfolio assessment, since adopting such a program would mean going from no program to an experimental program, with no intermediate stage. Indeed, when I read Marjorie Roemer, Lucille M. Schultz, and Russel K. Durst's "Portfolios and the Process of Change," this sentence jumped out at me: "Portfolio assessment speaks to a changed attitude about the teaching and judging of writing, and we would argue that the implementation of such assessment represents more sweeping change than may be apparent at the outset" (456). For some in our department, the prospect of such change was overwhelming. However, the interest of my five Freshman Writing Committee colleagues was genuine and enthusiastic, so we gave it our best.

We designed our portfolio around the central feature of English 112, our second semester composition course: the research essay. We figured that we could give that essay extra weight--around 50%--in our portfolio evaluation. Besides the research essay, the portfolio was to contain three other items: 1) a direct assessment, which was included for two reasons: a) as a "check" against the "uncontrolled, unobjective" (those words will return in this report) context of the portfolio, and b) to research a comparison of scores on the direct assessment and the portfolio; 2) an essay of the student's choice from essays written for English 112; 3) an "across the curriculum" essay, from a course not in the English department; and 4) a reflective letter, in which the student was to look back over his or her writing progress and also introduce the portfolio to the evaluation reader.

We all felt very good about the portfolio design; the only part of the design to which objections were raised was the "across the curriculum" essay, which some felt (and still feel) to be extraneous. But others of us felt it was a way to recognize and encourage professors outside of English who assigned writing and to recognize and encourage students to see writing outside of English as something we valued. All of us admit, however, that the "across the curriculum" essay caused us more problems than the other parts of the portfolios. We asked students to have their professors certify that they had written the "across the curriculum" essay in their courses, and that one request led to several problems: students who waited too long to revise their "across the curriculum" essays and so didn't revise them, students who had not written anything outside of English and so wrote a summary in the Writing Center (often the day before the portfolio was due), students who had waited too long to get professor's signatures, and students who thought they had saved essays from other classes but who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

couldn't find them. Nonetheless, there are a few of us who still see value in the "across the curriculum" essay, despite its attendant problems.

To summarize briefly our findings concerning the other portfolio elements: we learned several things from the direct assessment, we had some problems with the research essay evaluation, and we mainly enjoyed reading the personal choice essays. Some of our more general findings echo the findings of Roemer et al.: we enjoyed the chance to discuss papers and standards with each other, we enjoyed the chance to judge a body of work from each student, and we felt that the whole experience improved our teaching and judging of writing (462-463). We found ourselves sharing ideas about paper assignments and perceptions about each other's students; several times we found that a colleague's perspective on one of our students was a very useful corrective to our own perspective. Indeed, one of the great virtues of portfolio assessment is that it enables teachers of writing to gain another perspective as we make evaluations. Since the teaching of writing ultimately always involves our own emotions as well as the student's emotions, teachers of writing can have "blind spots"; we need an additional perspective on a student whose writing may have been, for example, not up to what we perceived as their ability, or better than what we had perceived. Portfolio assessment may be a very practical expression of that "double gesture, double science, double writing" which Derrida sees as essential to "writing," reading and understanding (1184). It allowed us to place our students, our teaching, and our evaluation in a bigger context, and in doing so, we gained, our evaluation gained and our students gained.

Perhaps our biggest gains, from the standpoints of understanding our evaluation and teaching better, came from our experience with the direct assessment. We gained in three ways from this part of the portfolio: 1) an understanding of how to use direct assessment as an occasion for critical thinking;2) an understanding of how our students perceive direct assessment differently from how we perceived it; and 3) an understanding of how direct assessment is a useful way to anchor our evaluation standards for the portfolio evaluation itself. We approached the direct assessment as an occasion for research and that purpose may have led to all the gains we made. We wanted to test the hypothesis that a direct assessment or "timed essay" is a separate writing mode, a separate genre of writing, something which students need to "study" in an of itself. Therefore, two of our committee--Loren Gruber and myself--decided we would ask our students to write two timed essays, one of them a "dry run" as preparation to the timed essay which would be a part of the portfolio. The other members of

our committee would not have a "dry run" timed essay; indeed, Ruth and Dale felt that the in-class essays that were already a part of their course would provide their students with enough preparation for the direct assessment. Of course, the idea that timed essays are a separate genre--an idea put forward most thoroughly by Leo Ruth and Sandra Murphy--is based on substantial research into direct assessment and how students perceive or read such assessment prompts. Because direct assessment is a special writing situation, with its own format, context, and student anxiety, students often react differently to direct assessment than they do to more expected classroom assignments. Loren and I decided to try and duplicate, as much as we could, the conditions of the portfolio timed essay in our "dry run" timed essays. We assigned several essays, discussed them in class, and discussed the prompt and the evaluation criteria. Furthermore, after we evaluated essays on the same 6-point scale that would be used for the portfolio timed essay, we discussed the scores with the students and required those student who performed poorly to revise their essays, to give them extra preparation for the portfolio timed essay. The results of this research were quite clear: Loren's- and my classes had higher mean scores than those classes which did not include a "dry run" (3.54 to 3.14). Our students had been fully prepared to write the timed essay, understood what was expected, and performed well. Needless to say, after these results the others on our committee began to see direct assessment as a separate genre, which students need to learn before they write formal assessment essays.

We also used the timed essay as a critical thinking exercise (which Loren will explain later) and as anchoring for the portfolio evaluation. This latter use was somewhat serendipitous. Although most assessment researchers recommend formal scoring sessions, we found we simply could not do that, given the demands of conferences and committees during the month between the timed essay and the portfolio due date. Therefore, we got together for an hour here, and hour there, or we took essays home (highly unprofessional!) to evaluate. Although this is not good assessment procedure, we feel that the several conversations we had during this three week period about borderline, adjudicated essays helped us prepare for the portfolio evaluation itself. When we evaluated the portfolios, we read rather rapidly; when problems arose--especially concerning the research essay (more below)--we were quick to stop, consult, and re-anchor. Our several conversations during the timed essay evaluation helped us spot evaluation problems and made corrections quickly, thereby improving our portfolio evaluation reliability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Our biggest problem in evaluating portfolios came from the one part of the portfolio on which we were most agreed: the research essay. In fact, our agreement may have led to the problem. We assumed that since we were all asking our students to write argumentative essays, that we shared criteria for evaluating research essays. However, we had some problems in evaluating portfolios because not all of our students wrote argumentative research essays and some students wrote excellent essays which were not argumentative but were thesis defenses or simply very good reports. However, one meeting quickly resolved the problem, as we decided to evaluate essays on their own merits but recognize that argumentative essays were on a slightly higher order than thesis defenses or reports.

By the end of the portfolio project, we experienced the same sense of shared benefits and gains in our teaching and evaluation that Roemer et al. and other portfolio researchers have articulated. We had worked very hard, learned a lot, and found ourselves to be a team. We were ready, even eager to lead our departmental colleagues to this new-found land of portfolio evaluation. However, they were not as eager to follow. Why? I and the others on our committee have asked ourselves that question several times over the past four months. Here are some of the answer we have come up with: 1) we underestimated the extent of allegiance among our colleagues to traditional pedagogy; 2) we--especially myself--did not see that people have to be available to change, and that availability is often sensitive to matters of style, of the way things are presented, and my enthusiasm for portfolio assessment was seen as too aggressive; 3) a call to change can be seen as a criticism of the past, and therefore resented; 4) some of our colleagues do not even like to think much about composition, much less writing assessment; 5) some of our colleagues still see any form of assessment as an intrusion into their classes; some of our colleagues do not want their students' work evaluated by someone else, fearing that their success as a teacher would be judged. All these reasons have validity; however, there is one more reason which has its place as well: time. I was hired to institute an assessment program; at first I was asked to institute a program within a year; we could have instituted a direct assessment within a year, but portfolio assessment requires a far longer lead-time, especially if faculty feel pressured and resist.

The arguments against the portfolio were basically three: 1) it would take too much time to evaluate; 2) it is too much work and we are already overworked; and 3) it is "unobjective and uncontrolled," and might lead to students turning in other people's work and getting "too much outside help" from writing tutors, instructors, and friends. We can easily grant the first

two arguments as valid' portfolios require a lot of time and a lot of work. However, we all felt that the time and effort were worthwhile, especially given the solid student support for the project, as evidenced by the survey we took of student attitudes at the end of the project. As with other research projects in portfolio assessments, our students found portfolios to be a rewarding, valuable experience. The argument about "objective" and "controlled" testing is based on assumptions about language, knowledge and writing which run counter to current writing research and theory, excluding writing as process from a place in writing assessment. I have great difficulty understanding such an argument since I have been researching self-evaluations as a way of including writing as process in writing assessment; my own research shows me that while self-evaluations are a useful, reliable addition to a direct assessment or placement, a self-evaluation added to a direct assessment is not as reliable for a proficiency assessment. I see proficiency assessment as requiring some dimension of reflection and self-evaluation; anything less than that tells us only about one performance, not writing ability. (At minimum, I see proficiency assessment as requiring three items--a minimal portfolio: a timed essay, a researched, public-discourse essay, and a reflective, self-evaluative essay on writing progress.)

As we prepare to institute a direct assessment, already some of our colleagues are beginning to see problems with it. Whereas the "p-word" (portfolio) is not mentioned in the department halls, some colleagues are talking about "a folder in which student collect their essays." I am hopeful that one day our experience with portfolio assessment will become valuable as Northwest reconsiders writing assessment.

Works Cited

Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context" in *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990, 1168-1184.

Roemer, Marjorie, Lucille M. Schultz, and Russel K. Durst. "Portfolios and the Process of Change." *College Composition and Communication* 42 (December 1991), 455-469.

Ruth, Leo, and Sandra Murphy. *Designing Writing Tasks for the Assessment of Writing.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1988

Northwest Missouri State University: Writing Portfolio Report Summary

Scoring Procedure:

1. Classes were suspended during the last week of the semester for scoring session (some classes saw films, wrote papers).
2. Every instructor first read and scored her or his students' portfolios.
3. We read portfolios from our colleagues' classes, recorded the scores.
4. We then read the portfolios a second time, recording the scores and placing the portfolios in a "2 Readings" box.
5. After the second reading, one of us collated the scores and placed portfolios with conflicting scores: more than two points apart, or at the 2-3 or 4-5 cut-off margins for failure (2) or distinction (5).

Scores:

Of 230 portfolios read, only 45 required a third reading (19.5%). Of these 45 portfolios, 19 of them were at the 4-5 margin. Instructors' scores were consistently higher than blind evaluations (the "halo effect" of knowing more of the student's effort and context). Inter-reader reliability between the first and second blind readers was remarkably high: 91.7% of the scores were not more than one score level apart; only 2.6% of all scores were two points apart. Between the instructor and the first reader, 90.2% of scores were within one; between the instructor and second reader, where only 86.9% of scores were within one point. Also, higher instructor scores are found when we compare scores higher than one point apart for each reader. Instructors scored 7.9% of portfolios higher than the first reader, while the first reader scored only 2.2% of portfolios higher than the instructor. The instructor scored even more, 10.3%, portfolios higher than the second reader, while the second reader only scored 2.6% of portfolios higher than the instructor. These percentages suggest a possible pattern in the scoring: that the longer evaluators read, the lower they score. From these scoring percentages, we can infer two recommendations: 1) that the scoring session be kept to two readings (with a third, judgment, reading where necessary); and 2) that the two readings be "outside," since there was more agreement among the scores of the two outside readers than between the instructor and either outside reader.

There are some interesting comparisons between the timed essay (direct assessment) and the portfolio scores. The mean portfolio score (3.60) was indeed higher than the mean timed essay score (3.31). However, four sections of the project gave two timed essays, to see if a "dry run" timed essay had a significant effect on students' scores. It did; the four sections with the "dry run" timed essay had higher means than the other sections, reinforcing the findings of other assessment researchers, that direct assessment (timed essay writing) is a separate writing mode and should be taught as such. The timed essay mean for those sections with a "dry run" timed essay was 3.54--significantly higher than the non-dry-run mean (3.14) and much closer to the portfolio mean (the "dry run" portfolio mean was 3.79). Furthermore, there is no evidence of a pattern indicating that the timed essay was consistently higher than the portfolio score. Nearly one-third of all students, 31.3% (or 72) received the exact same score on their portfolio as they had on their timed essay; 46.5% (or 107) received a higher score on their portfolios, but 22.2% (or 51) received a lower score on their portfolio than on their timed essay. Indeed, the evidence supports other assessment researchers who maintain that direct assessment and portfolio assessment simply measure different things.

Scoring Time:

The entire scoring session, from the instructors' reading through the two blind readings and the judgment (or "third"--but, actually, a fourth) reading for undecided scores, took from May 4 to May

14 (ten days), or 73.5 hours. Given that each instructor would only read his or her own sections in a traditional 112 class, then we can say that the portfolio project added, on average, 6-8 hours of extra effort to each instructor's course workload for portfolio evaluation. Of course, those instructors who teach more sections of 112 should be expected to spend more time in portfolio evaluation than those instructors who teach fewer sections of 112. However, making the amount of reading time exactly proportional would be asking too much of those instructors who teach three sections of 112; we recommend, therefore, that instructors with fewer sections of 112 strive to read 10 more portfolios than their share in order to even out the burden.

All of us agreed that we spent more time reading our own students' portfolios than we did holistically scoring the portfolios of our colleagues. Some of us felt we were still taking too much time in holistic scoring--we continued to read "as if grading," which is a slower process. We feel that the department will need six things to be able to score portfolios within a week's time:

1. Further training in holistic assessment
2. More unified, articulated and applied criteria for the research essay (50% of the portfolio score)
3. Suspended English 112 classes--or other activities for students, while instructors score portfolios
4. Proportional--as much as possible--reading responsibilities for instructors: an instructor with three sections of 112 should read more than instructors with one section. However, instructors with only 1-2 section should read 10 portfolios more than their share.
5. Portfolio evaluators should be paid.
6. Only two outside readings--instructors should allow portfolios to be evaluated by departmental colleagues

Portfolio Scores/ Instructor's Grades:

When we compared the portfolio scores to the grades we were likely or had given our students, we found a remarkable degree of similarity. Only a few times did our grades differ from the outside assessments of our colleagues. Besides, we felt that we could still give our own grades and recognize those students who had expended a great degree of effort and had earned a higher grade than the portfolio evaluation would seem to indicate (or conversely, students who might not have worked as hard as the portfolio score seemed to indicate).

The biggest problem in this area is what to do if the portfolio fails. We agreed that a portfolio score of 2 or below would be failing; none of us were willing to defend those portfolios which failed. For this project, all final grades were determined by the course instructor; roughly speaking, most of portfolios with scores of 2 were by students who received D's. Only 7 portfolios received a score of 2 (1 received a score of 1); most of these students will receive a D for their grade. However, if the department adopts the portfolio program, the portfolio should determine whether a student passes a course. Ultimately, the problem between portfolio scores and course grades come down to the grade of D. Does the department think the grade of D in English 112 is helpful to students? All other portfolio scores (3-6) are superceded by the instructor's grade. If the department eliminates the grade of D for English 112, then there will be no conflict between the portfolio scores and the instructor's grades.

The Research Essay :

We agreed that the research paper would count approximately 50% of the portfolio score. However, the variety of research papers within the portfolios led to problems in evaluation. Although we had agreed to assign argumentative research papers, few of the papers were argumentative. During one session

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

scoring 40 portfolios, one evaluator found only 4 argumentative essays. Portfolios contained the following essay types: thesis defense (a positive argument without an answer to an opposition); thesis report (a weak thesis but a well-organized report); technical explanations or process papers (quite suitable for a technical writing class, but not arguments); or simple reports (sometimes known as "notecard choo-choo trains"--loosely organized essays with each paragraph being a summary of a separate source). This disparity made it difficult to rate research papers against each other; it is easier to rate apples against apples, not apples against oranges. An evaluator would find a fairly successful argument in one portfolio, and then in the next portfolio find a very well-expressed and organized report. Which should the evaluator rate higher: the report or the argument? We met and agreed that argument would be favored over report. Nonetheless, the disparity between modes slowed down our evaluation and increased the number of judgement readings (especially at the 4-5 margin).

We believe that the problem of disparity in research essays is in great part due to the condition of English 112 as a course. The course description only specifies a "documented research essay," while the course rationale twice indicates that the course should help students become more aware of audience ("writing is accomplished through a process in which the writer imagines the audience, sets goals, develops ideas, produces notes, drafts and a revised text, and edits to meed the audience's expectations"). We believe the course description for English 112 should be rewritten to clarify that the course is primarily concerned with argumentation. There always needs to be a close correlation between writing assessment and writing instruction, so that students are demonstrably prepared for the assessment. Indeed, between a direct assessment and portfolio assessment, the portfolio method would be <u>less</u> focused on argumentation than would a direct assessment, but allowing at least part of the student's writing to be non-argumentative.

<u>The Place of the Direct Assessment in the Portfolio:</u>

Some of our inter-reader reliability can be attributed to two factors: 1) we had discussed standards and criteria for evaluation throughout the semester; and 2) the direct assessment which we scored throughout April (the test was given March 26-27), had provided us with a significant "anchoring" experience.

Developing a timed essay question is an extra step for instructors, who must meet and agree on an appropriate prompt and on evaluative criteria will be. However, the experience of scoring the timed essays--while laborious and time consuming (and at just the wrong time of the semester for most of us: when our students were working on their research essays)--secured in our minds the 6 point evaluation scale and gave us confidence in each other as evaluators. Although some of us wondered, at the beginning of the semester, whether the timed essay was even necessary in a portfolio, all of us now believe that it adds to the program in four significant ways: 1) as an introduction to argument for many of our students; 2) as helping our students prepare for hour exams in other classes; 3) as occasions for critical thinking workshops; and 4) as anchoring sessions for evaluators.

We feel that if students are to be assessed partially or in full through a timed essay, then they will need to have a practice or "dry run" timed essay before the one that "counts"; we realize that introducing two timed essays into the English 112 syllabus will mean that many present 112 syllabi will have to be seriously revised. However, we are impressed, again, by the usefulness of the timed essay and the foundation it provided for a successful portfolio scoring session.

<u>Features of a Successful Portfolio Course:</u>

While every member of the portfolio project teaches differently, there are some features common to the success of a portfolio project course:

1. A portfolio is not "added on" to a previously existing course. Portfolio assessment requires revising one's course.
2. Students are encouraged and expected to revise; some students revised essays 4-5 times. Writing Center tutors provide useful support.
3. Timed essay writing is treated as a special writing mode; a "dry run" timed essay introduces students to the timed essay format and argumentative structure, and provides valuable critical thinking and discussion.
4. Adequate time is provided for portfolio production; suggested time: two weeks, including one week for revising the research essay.
5. The reflective introductory letter encourages students to think about their gains in writing--what problems they've had, what they've learned--and helps them "own" their portfolio and their writing.

Other Recommendations:

1. All sections should include a "dry run" timed essay, to prepare students for the portfolio timed essay.
2) The course syllabus should have a uniform attendance policy, so that instructors can refuse to certify a student's portfolio if attendance is poor.
3) Instructors act as "gatekeepers" to the portfolio evaluation and certify the portfolio for evaluation. If they suspect plagiarism, then they can refuse to forward the portfolio on to the evaluators.
4) Portfolios are best contained, at minimum, in folders with pockets, not in file folders.
5) Portfolio scores should <u>not</u> be the ultimate grade determinant.
6) A "base" year is necessary to establish clearer scoring ranges and standards.

Mean Scores, by Section: (* indicates section with a preparatory "dry-run" timed essay)

Section		ACT mean	Section		ACT mean
01:	portfolio mean: 3.54 timed essay mean: 3.00	19.59	24:	portfolio mean: 3.13 timed essay mean: 3.00	19.68
06:	portfolio mean: 3.56 timed essay mean: 3.42 *	21.43	32:	portfolio mean: 4.04 timed essay mean: 3.74 *	19.80
09:	portfolio mean: 3.77 timed essay mean: 3.52 *	21.71	35:	portfolio mean: 3.61 timed essay mean: 3.24	19.65
17:	portfolio mean: 3.20 timed essay mean: 3.23	19.60	37:	portfolio mean: 3.79 timed essay mean: 3.51 *	20.95
18:	portfolio mean: 3.76 timed essay mean: 3.33	21.27	3A:	portfolio mean: 3.56 timed essay mean: 3.22	20.67
23:	portfolio mean: 3.65 timed essay mean: 3.00	21.56			